UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,744	09/11/2006	Bartlomiej Jan Pawlak	NL040280 9792	
65913 NXP, B.V.	EXAM	EXAMINER		
	ECTUAL PROPERTY	FOURSON III, GEORGE R		
1109 MCKAY	DRIVE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN JOSE, CA	x 95131	2823		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/08/2008	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

Office Action Summary		Application No.		Applicant(s)		
		10/598,744	PAWLAK, BARTLOMIEJ JAN		OMIEJ JAN	
		Examiner		Art Unit		
		George Four	son	2823		
The MAILING DATE Period for Reply	of this communication a	ppears on the c	over sheet with the c	correspondence ac	ddress	
A SHORTENED STATUT WHICHEVER IS LONGEI - Extensions of time may be availat after SIX (6) MONTHS from the n - If NO period for reply is specified - Failure to reply within the set or ex	R, FROM THE MAILING ble under the provisions of 37 CFR and ailing date of this communication. above, the maximum statutory period tended period for reply will, by statuter than three months after the main	DATE OF THIS 1.136(a). In no event od will apply and will e ute, cause the applica	COMMUNICATION however, may a reply be tin xpire SIX (6) MONTHS from tion to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•	
Status						
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINA</b> l 3)□ Since this application	munication(s) filed on <u>24</u> 2b) The real to the re	nis action is nor ance except fo	r formal matters, pro		e merits is	
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are 4a) Of the above cla 5)□ Claim(s) is/a 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are 7)□ Claim(s) is/a 8)□ Claim(s) are  Application Papers	im(s) is/are withdr re allowed. rejected. re objected to.	rawn from cons				
	on is/are: a) ac uest that any objection to th sheet(s) including the corre	ccepted or b) ne drawing(s) be ection is required	held in abeyance. See if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 C	, ,	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (P' 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Pater 3) Information Disclosure Statem Paper No(s)/Mail Date	t Drawing Review (PTO-948)	_	)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da )  Notice of Informal F )  Other:	ate		

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 6, "comprising" should be - - consisting of - - . Appropriate correction is required.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keys et al 2004/0235280.

It is noted that in the instant claims "dopant" is used to encompass non-conductive impurities. Also, "dopant atoms" and "dopant ions" are used interchangeably where in ion implantation processes it is ions that are implanted. The following rejection is predicated on these uses.

Keys et al discloses formation of a p-type or n-type transistor [0035, figures 5A and 5B and accompanying description] including implanting Si or Ge ions to amorphize a portion of an n-doped substrate region [0024], implanting F temporary ions [0025-0026], annealing at 400-800°C for 5-120 seconds [0028] then implanting boron ions [0027]. See figure 3. The recited annealing temperature range overlaps the disclosed range.

The claims do not require the heat treatment in the range of 500-800°C to be performed after the introduction of the dopant atoms. With respect to claim 3, the claim

merely labels portions of the heat treatment as "a heat treatment" and "a further heat treatment". With respect to claim 4, LDD formation is shown in figures 5A and 5B.

With respect to claim 7, there is overlap between the recited duration and that disclosed [0028].

Applicant's arguments with respect to the above rejection are addressed in the statement of the rejection above.

Claims 3 and 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keys et al 2004/0235280 as applied to claims 1-9 above, and further in view of either Wu et al 4584026, of record.

With respect to claim 3, in the event that claim 3 requires separate heat treatments, the following rejection is applied.

Keys et al does not disclose limiting the process to temperatures lower than 800°C or performing a heat treatment below 800°C after the dopant atom introduction.

Wu et al discloses activation of boron implanted silicon following fluorine implantation at temperatures lower than 800°C to reduce dopant diffusion (col.3, lines 14-17 and 47-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Keys et al and Wu et al to enable the activation step of Keys et al to be performed according to the teachings of Wu et al because in such a process the process of Wu et al would be used for it's disclosed intended purpose and therefor

one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success that the process would be suitable in achieving the predictable result of the activation disclosed by Keys et al and furthermore to reduce dopant diffusion as stated above.

Claims 3,10,12,13 and 15-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keys et 2004/0235280 as applied to claims 1-9 above, and further in view of Downey et al.

With respect to claim 3, in the event that claim 3 requires separate heat treatments, the following rejection is applied.

Keys et al does not disclose limiting the process to temperatures lower than 800°C or performing a heat treatment below 800°C after the dopant atom introduction.

Downey et al discloses a 550-800°C anneal in addition to a higher temperature anneal in activation of boron implanted silicon following fluorine implantation to remove residual damage and remove fluorine (col.6, lines 24-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Keys et al and Downey et al to include the further heat treatment of Downey et al in the process of Keys et al for the purpose of removing residual damage and removing fluorine (col.6, lines 24-33).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Fourson whose telephone number is (571)272-1860272-1860. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Smith, can be reached on (571) 272-1907. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/George Fourson/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2823